DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 097 CE 037 974

AUTHOR Pfister, Jill; Newcomb, L. H.
TITLE Evaluation of the Student Teaching Program in Agricultural Education at the Ohio State University. Summary of Research.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Dept. of Agricultural Education.
REPORT NO OSU-SR-33
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Evaluation; *Agricultural Education; Cooperating Teachers; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Student Attitudes; Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors; *Student Teaching; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; *Vocational Education; Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio State University

ABSTRACT

To evaluate the student teaching program in agricultural education at The Ohio State University, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and student teachers were asked their perceptions regarding the need for experiences and assignments and the extent to which they were accomplished. Cooperating teachers and student teachers also rated the performance of university supervisors in supervision of student teachers, and university supervisors and student teachers rated the performance of cooperating teachers. Data were collected by mailed questionnaires, face-to-face interviews, and telephone interviews. All but two experiences expected during student teaching were considered essential, and the student teachers were perceived to be adequately prepared to teach. All assignments were rated desirable except two that were rated essential. A majority of the assignments were rated as satisfactorily accomplished. Generally rated as above average, university supervisors needed more emphasis on prior evaluation of student teachers' lesson plans and service as a resource person for cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers needed greater emphasis on feedback on lesson plans prior to teaching, evaluation of student teacher's performance, and provision for experience in adult and/or continuing education and supervised occupational experience visits. Better preparation of cooperating teachers and changes in assignments were recommended. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED239097

EVALUATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION AT THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Jill Pfister and L. H. Newcomb

INTRODUCTION

Student teaching has long been accepted as a vital component in teacher education programs. In fact, "student teaching is the most universally approved education course, both by educators and the general public--approved rather generally by the severest critics of professional teacher education" (Andrews, 1964). There is almost nationwide agreement that the student teaching experience is one of the most important, if not the most important phase in the preparation of a teacher (National Education Association, 1966).

By definition, student teaching is a period of guided teaching when a college student assumes increasing responsibility for directing the learning of a group or groups of learners over a period of consecutive weeks (Andrews, 1964). As a culminating experience, it functions

CE037974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J D McCracken
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

as a maturing activity. Student teaching is the most important "learning by doing" portion of the preservice teacher education program. Also, it provides a setting in which the student teacher often functions in the role of self-critic.

Thorpe (1972) discussed student teaching by saying that the immediate supervision of the student teaching experience is a result of a triadic relationship between the student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor. The need for synergistic action in this triad is fundamental to a well-integrated student teaching program. With such action, the total effect of the student teaching program will be greater than the sum action of the student teacher role, cooperating teacher role and university supervisor role taken independently.

Since student teaching is such an important part of the teacher education program, it is important that it be a high-quality experience. To determine if student teaching provides a high-quality experience, it is first necessary to determine what experiences are expected of a student teacher and then determine if these experiences are actually occurring. Next, the effectiveness of the student teaching program in accomplishing the experiences must be measured. When relating determination of quality to the student teacher/cooperating teacher/university supervisor triadic relationship, one must evaluate the performance of the cooperating teacher and university supervisor in the supervision of the student teacher. The reason for evaluating their performance is because their role is to help the student teacher have a professionally rewarding experience. It has been said that there is a need to delimit and understand the interrelationships among participants within the context of the total student teaching experience (Zimpher, De Voss and Nott, 1980). The need of evaluation of effort and outcomes is axiomatic if an individual or group is really concerned with direction and growth. Merely to continue without evaluating is somewhat analogous to the marksman who continues shooting with no heed as to what is happening to the target (Flesher, 1958).

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University by answering the following research questions:

1. To what extent are the experiences and assignments a student teacher is expected to have in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture as perceived by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers?

2. To what extent are these experiences and assignments accomplished by the student teaching program as perceived by university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University?

3. How do cooperating teachers and student teachers rate the performance of university supervisors in their supervision of student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University?

4. How do university supervisors and student teachers rate the performance of cooperating teachers in their supervision of student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University?

5. What suggestions for changes can be made by the researchers to improve the student teaching program in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University as a result of this study?

METHODOLOGY

Three populations were involved in the study. The population of university supervisors included all full-time regular faculty members of the Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University who were responsible for the supervision of student teachers for the school years 1979, 1980 and 1981 (n = 14). The second population consisted of all cooperating teachers with whom agricultural education student teachers were placed over the same three-year period (n = 88). The last population was comprised of undergraduates who student taught in agricultural education during the school years 1979, 1980 and 1981 (n = 141).

Data were collected by means of three separate mailed questionnaires followed by face-to-face interviews with a sample of university supervisors and telephone interviews with a sample of cooperating teachers and a sample of student teachers. This triangulation approach enabled the researchers to integrate both quantitative and qualitative methods of research. Such an integration could counterbalance the weaknesses and capture the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative research (Patton, 1980). Triangulation moves from description to verification through the use of four basic types of triangulation: data, investigative, theoretical and methodological (Denzin, 1978). Data and methodological triangulation were incorporated into this study.

Mailed Questionnaires

A different questionnaire was developed by the researchers for each population. The first part of each of the three questionnaires was a checklist of the experiences and assignments for student teachers in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which each experience and assignment was needed in preparing a prospective teacher for successful teaching in vocational agriculture and then indicate the extent to which each experience and assignment was accomplished during student teaching.

The second part of the questionnaire included a rating of the performance of the cooperating teacher or university supervisor or both. University supervisors were asked to rate the performance of cooperating teachers on

30 items identified as responsibilities of the cooperating teacher in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University. Cooperating teachers were asked to rate the university supervisor's performance on twelve items. Student teachers were asked to evaluate the performance of both their university supervisor and their cooperating teacher. There were eight items pertaining to the performance of the university supervisor and 27 items pertaining to the performance of the cooperating teacher on the student teacher questionnaire. Eleven fill-in-the-blank questions were included in the student teacher questionnaire to obtain quantitative data regarding student teaching.

A panel of twelve experts representing the three populations critiqued each instrument. Each item was examined for its relevance to student teaching. The questionnaires were then field tested with three university supervisors, six cooperating teachers and six student teachers. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were computed for all parts of each of the instruments, and reliabilities ranged from .79 to .96 for each of the parts.

Data were collected by mailed questionnaires followed by a postcard reminder and then a second questionnaire to the non-respondents. The response was 100% of the university supervisors, 90% of the cooperating teachers and 81% of the student teachers. Data from the non-respondent groups were obtained by mail and telephone. Results showed no differences between the responding and non-responding groups for both the cooperating teachers and student teachers.

Data were analyzed by using the services of the Instruction and Research Computer Center at The Ohio State University.

Interview Schedule

To probe deeper into the responses of the participants to find out why respondents answered the items the way they did and how they perceived why others responded the way they did, a randomly selected group of respondents from each population participated in the interview. Due to the time and expense of interviewing, the samples were limited to six university supervisors who were interviewed face to face and eight cooperating teachers and nine student teachers who were interviewed by phone. The preliminary analysis of the mailed questionnaires assisted in formulating the face-to-face and telephone interview schedules. The reseachers were seeking qualitative data to answer questions such as:

1. Why were there discrepancies between the responses of each of the three populations?

2. What examples could the respondents cite to explain why certain experiences and assignments were identified as essential and not satisfactorily accomplished?

3. What were some strengths and weaknesses of the student teaching program?

A summary of the data collected from the interviews was developed discussing FFA, supervised occupational experience programs, summer program of activities, adult education, performance of university supervisors, performance of coordinating teachers and strengths and weaknesses of the student teaching program.

FINDINGS

The levels of need for the experiences and assignments, the extent to which the experiences and assignments are accomplished, the performance of the cooperating teacher and the performance of the university supervisor reported by the three groups of respondents were analyzed by computing the respective means for each of the experiences, assignments and activities completed during student teaching. A scale was used to allow for meaningful interpretation of the results of these mean scores. The mean levels of need were analyzed and discussed using the values shown on the scale below.

Not Needed	Optional	Desirable	Essential
1	1.599	2.599	3.599 4

Similarly, all mean levels of accomplishment were interpreted using the values illustrated below.

Not Accomplished	Partially Accomplished	Satisfactorily Accomplished	Accomplished Well
1	1.599	2.599	3.599 4

The mean ratings of performance were interpreted using the values on the scale below:

Poor	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Superior
1	1.999	3.999	5.999	7.999 9

Table 1

Rank Order of Mean Levels of Need for Experiences
as Perceived by University Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers, and Student Teachers

Experiences	University Supervisors (N = 14)			Cooperating Teachers (N = 76)			Student Teachers (N = 106)		
	RANK	MEAN	SD	RANK	MEAN	SD	RANK	MEAN	SD
Directs student learning activities	1	4.000	0.000	1	3.882	0.325	3	3.787	0.454
Writes lesson plans	2	3.929	0.267	5	3.763	0.425	6	3.660	0.620
Identifies and outlines unit topics and develops behavioral objectives for classes taught	4	3.857	0.363	9	3.671	0.473	7	3.604	0.564
Applies basic teaching procedures	4	3.857	0.363	2	3.868	0.377	1.5	3.806	0.420
Evaluates the performance of students	4	3.857	0.363	4	3.813	0.425	1.5	3.806	0.442
Teaches the students to use, summarize and analyze the record books of supervised occupational experience programs	7.5	3.786	0.426	10	3.605	0.568	10	3.495	0.635
Advises the FFA	7.5	3.786	0.426	11	3.573	0.619	11	3.463	0.676
Develops a procedure to insure students' safety and protection	7.5	3.786	0.426	6	3.720	0.452	5	3.722	0.561
Can plan and conduct a summer program of activities	7.5	3.786	0.426	12	3.400	0.658	15	3.168	0.758
Develops a weekly schedule of teaching	10.5	3.714	0.469	3	3.827	0.381	4	3.729	0.506
Uses instructional media and resources	10.5	3.714	0.469	7	3.697	0.462	8	3.583	0.549
Develops a plan for teacher and/or employer supervision of occupational experience programs	12	3.571	0.646	16	3.105	0.759	18	2.981	0.743
Plans and supervises long time occupational experience programs	14	3.357	0.497	17	3.053	0.728	17	3.028	0.716
Counsels students	14	3.357	0.745	18	3.092	0.734	16	3.065	0.780
Can plan and develop a vocational agriculture program	14	3.357	0.929	13	3.368	0.690	9	3.565	0.631
Participates in teachers' meetings and professional conferences	16	3.286	0.426	9	3.627	0.514	12	3.463	0.587
Prepares and conducts group instruction in adult education	18	3.071	0.730	21	2.733	0.622	21	2.620	0.862
Conducts visits concerning individual problems of adults	18	3.071	0.730	22	2.427	0.756	23	2.426	0.878
Conducts activities which aid in developing good school and community relations	18	3.071	0.829	15	3.173	0.785	14	3.243	0.642
Uses high school guidance program to obtain and interpret background information concerning students	20	3.000	0.784	19	2.987	0.663	19	2.935	0.789
Administers and maintains physical facilities	21.5	2.857	0.770	14	3.200	0.678	13	3.393	0.655
Identifies appropriate topics for an adult education program	21.5	2.857	0.770	20	2.959	0.671	20	2.778	0.789
Advises the FFA Alumni Affiliate	23	2.143	0.663	23	2.270	0.688	22	2.491	0.842

1 = not needed
2 = optional
3 = desirable
4 = essential

Kendall coefficient of concordance = W = .91

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Level of Need for Experiences

As Table 1 indicates, university supervisors rated 11 of the 23 experiences as essential, and one experience was considered optional. Cooperating teachers rated ten experiences as essential and two experiences as optional. Student teachers rated seven of the experiences as essential and two optional. All three groups rated advising the FFA Alumni Affiliate as optional.

The pedagogical areas such as: evaluation of student performance, applies basic teaching procedures, develops a weekly schedule of teaching, identifies and outlines unit topics and develops behavioral objectives, writes lesson plans and directs student learning activities were rated as essential experiences by all three populations. Differences in rating of need between the three populations occurred in the following experiences: opportunities to advise the FFA, use of record books, experiences involving adult education and experiences involving supervised occupational experience programs.

Table 1 shows the similarities and differences among the three groups in how they ranked the 23 experiences. Though the three groups exhibited variations in ranking, the value of the Kendall coefficient of concordance W was .91 which indicates a very strong agreement on the ranking of need for the experiences.

Level of Accomplishment for Experiences

It was very apparent that the student teachers were adequately prepared to teach in the classroom. Table 2 reports that the pedagogical areas listed in the previous section were rated as being at least satisfactorily accomplished or accomplished well. During the interviews, the cooperating teachers emphasized that the student teachers were prepared for classroom teaching upon entering the student teaching experience.

Of the 11 experiences identified as essential by the university supervisor group, three experiences were not satisfactorily accomplished. The three experiences were: (a) advises the FFA; (b) teaches students to use, summarize and analyze record books; and (c) can plan and conduct a summer program of activities.

All ten experiences identified as essential by the cooperating teacher group were satisfactorily accomplished, but six experiences rated as desirable were partially accomplished.

The lowest three experiences reported as partially accomplished by the student teachers were: (a) prepares and conducts group instruction in adult education; (b) conducts visits concerning individual problems of adults; and (c) advises the FFA Alumni Affiliate. These same three experiences were rated lowest by cooperating teachers, and the last two were rated lowest by university supervisors. All three groups rated experiences in planning and supervising occupational experience programs as partially accomplished.

Table 2

Rank Order of Mean Levels of Accomplishment for Experiences
as Perceived by University Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers

Experiences	University Supervisors (N = 14)			Cooperating Teachers (N = 76)			Student Teachers (N = 108)		
	RANK	MEAN	SD	RANK	MEAN	SD	RANK	MEAN	SD
Evaluates the performance of students	1	3.077	0.494	8	3.149	0.634	2	3.449	0.618
Applies basic teaching procedures	2.5	3.071	0.730	7	3.213	0.741	1	3.467	0.619
Participates in teacher's meetings and professional conferences	2.5	3.071	0.829	1	3.393	0.718	4	3.358	0.842
Develops a weekly schedule of teaching	4.5	2.929	0.475	5	3.333	0.600	8	3.113	0.760
Uses instructional media and resources	4.5	2.929	0.616	4	3.313	0.697	6	3.264	0.734
Identifies and outlines unit topics and develops behavioral objectives for classes taught	6	2.857	0.663	6	3.237	0.630	7	3.238	0.714
Writes lesson plans	8	2.786	0.579	2	3.360	0.690	5	3.308	0.806
Directs student learning activities	8	2.786	0.699	5	3.289	0.727	3	3.393	0.749
Develops a procedure to insure students' safety and protection	8	2.786	0.699	9	3.067	0.811	10	3.065	0.904
Uses high school guidance program to obtain and interpret background information concerning students	10	2.538	0.519	11	2.867	0.875	11	2.869	0.848
Advises the FFA	11	2.500	0.760	10	2.932	0.728	14	2.802	0.950
Counsels students	12	2.429	0.514	12	2.800	0.771	13	2.811	0.829
Develops a plan for teacher and/or employer supervision of occupational experience programs	14	2.214	0.426	17	2.539	0.901	17	2.181	0.928
Administers and maintains the physical facilities	14	2.214	0.214	15	2.627	0.785	9	3.075	0.836
Conducts activities which aid in developing good school and community relations	14	2.214	0.699	13	2.747	0.773	15	2.695	0.956
Teaches students to use, summarize and analyze the record books of supervised occupational experience programs	17.5	1.929	0.475	14	2.658	0.703	16	2.538	0.938
Plans and supervises long time occupational experience programs	17.5	1.929	0.475	18	2.408	0.734	20	2.065	0.804
Prepares and conducts group instruction in adult education	17.5	1.929	0.616	21	2.041	0.818	21	1.786	0.991
Can plan and develop a vocational agriculture program	17.5	1.929	0.730	16	2.587	0.934	12	2.829	0.778
Identifies appropriate topics for an adult education program	20.5	1.714	0.611	19	2.222	0.826	19	2.112	1.003
Can plan and conduct a summer program of activities	20.5	1.714	0.825	20	2.162	0.980	18	2.114	1.086
Conducts visits concerning individual problems of adults	22	1.692	0.855	22	1.827	0.828	22	1.676	1.925
Advises the FFA Alumni Affiliate	23	1.571	0.756	23	1.589	0.704	23	1.550	0.885

1 = not accomplished
2 = partially accomplished
3 = satisfactorily accomplished
4 = accomplished well

Kendall coefficient of concordance = w = .93

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Even though there were some differences, the Kendall coefficient of concordance W was .93. This coefficient indicates a very strong agreement on the rankings of the accomplishment of the 23 experiences.

Levels of Need for Assignments

As shown in Table 3, all the assignments were rated desirable except two which were rated essential. University supervisors rated the statement preparation of an objective self-evaluation with strengths and limitations as a vocational agriculture teacher by the student teacher as an essential assignment for student teachers. Cooperating teachers rated planning and conducting a field trip as an essential part of student teaching. It was the general feeling of the respondents of all three samples interviewed that the assignments were important and most were beneficial. Those interviewed felt that the assignments should enhance the student teaching experiences, and their purpose should be clearly understood by all members of the student teaching triad. The Kendall coefficient of concordance W exhibited very strong agreement (W = .80).

Level of Accomplishment for Assignments

A majority of the assignments were rated as satisfactorily accomplished by all three populations (refer to Table 4). Those assignments that were rated as partially accomplished by at least one population were:

1. Prepare a brief report after interviewing suggested persons concerning the continuing education program.

2. Participate in planning and conducting a meeting for adult students.

3. Have cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet.

4. Determine the grade level of reading materials used in supervised study.

5. Review with guidance personnel the reading levels of students.

6. Complete a survey of each student's reading habits in classes taught.

The reason the assignments in adult education were partially accomplished was that approximately 67% of the student teachers reported they experienced no adult and/or continuing education instruction. When asked why the reading assignments were rated as partially accomplished, the cooperating teachers reported that the assignments were new and needed some more time to develop. The only assignment rated as not accomplished was have the cooperating teacher evaluate the student teacher's lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet prior to teaching. The university supervisors felt this assignment was not being accomplished. When the sample of cooperating teachers was asked their feelings, they responded that the university supervisors were

Table 3

Rank Order of Mean Levels of Need for Assignments
as Perceived by University Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers

Assignments	University Supervisors (N = 14)			Cooperating Teachers (N = 76)			Student Teachers (N = 108)		
	RANK	MEAN	SD	RANK	MEAN	SD	RANK	MEAN	SD
Prepares evaluation of student teacher's strengths and limitations as a teacher of vocational agriculture	1	3.643	0.199	5	3.474	0.553	9	3.311	0.695
Prepares two brief reports describing satisfactory supervised occupational experience visits	2	3.571	0.646	6	3.461	0.576	8	3.361	0.742
Maintains a notebook containing all lesson plans	4	3.500	0.760	3	3.566	0.618	1	3.579	0.630
Have cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet	4	3.500	0.760	11	3.237	0.651	6.5	3.383	0.682
Plan and conduct a field trip	4	3.500	0.174	1	3.707	0.487	2	3.575	0.616
Establish a notebook for teaching to be reviewed by agricultural education faculty	7.5	3.429	0.646	9	3.347	0.688	6.5	3.383	0.682
Have cooperating teacher evaluate field trip	7.5	3.429	0.646	4	3.526	0.553	11	3.093	0.838
Review chapter budget and discuss with cooperating teacher how finances are handled with the school office	7.5	3.429	0.646	8	3.395	0.655	3	3.472	0.618
Prepare evaluation of the cooperative training center with suggestions for improving the student teaching experience at that school	7.5	3.429	0.756	7	3.400	0.615	5	3.406	0.714
Evaluate the FFA program of activities with the FFA officers	10	3.357	0.663	10	3.263	0.661	10	3.222	0.601
Participate in planning and conducting a meeting for adult students	11	3.214	0.802	17	2.840	0.699	16	2.764	0.750
Maintain mileage report	12.5	3.143	0.663	2	3.579	0.617	4	3.435	0.752
Prepare a brief report after interviewing suggested persons concerning adult and continuing education program	12.5	3.143	0.864	16	2.880	0.770	17	2.676	0.946
Determine grade level of reading material used in supervised study in agriculture classes	14.5	3.000	0.784	19	2.684	0.677	13	2.889	0.740
Prepare an article for school or local newspaper concerning student teacher in vocational agriculture department	14.5	3.000	0.784	14	3.092	0.831	20	2.611	0.915
Select student for case study and prepare report	16	2.929	0.997	15	2.961	0.871	15	2.833	0.942
Reveiw with guidance personnel reading levels of students in agriculture classes	17	2.857	0.663	18	2.711	0.708	19	2.639	0.791
Write a brief description of chapter noting strengths and weaknesses suggested by officers	18	2.786	0.802	13	3.133	0.664	12	3.009	0.743
Maintain a daily diary of activities	19.5	2.643	0.842	12	3.197	0.712	14	2.843	1.006
Complete a survey of each student's reading habits in classes taught	19.5	2.643	0.929	20	2.653	0.797	18	2.673	0.898

1 = not needed
2 = optional
3 = desirable
4 = essential

Kendall coefficient of concordance = w = .80

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4

Rank Order of Mean Levels of Accomplishment for Assignments
as Perceived by University Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers

Assignments	University Supervisors (N = 14)			Cooperating Teachers (N = 76)			Student Teachers (N = 108)		
	RANK	MEAN	SD	RANK	MEAN	SD	RANK	MEAN	SD
Maintain a mileage report	1	3.500	0.760	2	3.520	0.685	6	3.274	0.931
Plan and conduct a field trip	2.5	3.357	0.633	1	3.611	0.618	3	3.491	0.759
Select a student for case study and prepare report	2.5	3.357	0.633	9	3.227	0.669	4	3.396	0.699
Maintain a daily diary of activities	4	3.286	0.726	8	3.233	0.717	7	3.250	0.867
Establish a notebook for teaching to be reviewed by agricultural education faculty	6	3.214	0.802	5	3.452	0.646	1	3.566	0.602
Maintain a notebook containing all lesson plans	6	3.214	0.802	3	3.493	0.665	2	3.509	0.636
Prepare two brief reports describing satisfactory supervised occupational experience visits	6	3.214	0.699	6	3.360	0.561	5	3.393	0.749
Have cooperating teacher evaluate field trip	8	3.071	0.829	4	3.480	0.601	8	3.217	0.946
Prepare evaluation of student teacher's strengths and limitations as a teacher of vocational agriculture	9	3.000	0.577	7	3.293	0.731	9	3.076	0.863
Write a brief description of chapter noting strengths and weaknesses suggested by officers	11	2.929	0.616	15	2.917	0.884	14	2.850	1.017
Review chapter budget and discuss with cooperating teacher how finances are handled with the school office	11	2.929	0.616	10	3.160	0.823	11	3.019	0.911
Prepare evaluation of cooperative training center with suggestions for improving the student teaching experience in that school	11	2.929	0.730	12	3.086	0.974	10	3.057	0.994
Prepare an article for school or local newspaper concerning student teacher in vocational agriculture department	13	2.857	0.663	13	3.067	0.963	15	2.848	1.133
Review with guidance personnel reading levels of students in agriculture classes	14	2.692	0.855	18	2.493	0.891	18	2.548	0.954
Evaluate the FFA program of activities with the FFA officers	15	2.643	0.745	14	3.041	0.851	12	2.879	1.013
Complete a survey of each student's reading habits in classes taught	16	2.615	0.870	17	2.514	0.983	17	2.683	1.054
Determine the grade level of reading materials used in supervised study in agriculture classes	17	2.462	0.660	19	2.400	0.900	16	2.745	1.052
Prepare a brief report after interviewing suggested persons concerning continuing education program	18.5	2.000	0.784	16	2.671	0.987	19	2.314	1.041
Participate in planning and conducting a meeting for adult students	18.5	2.000	0.555	20	2.360	0.895	20	2.087	1.049
Have cooperating teacher evaluate each lesson plan using the lesson plan check sheet	20	1.929	0.475	11	3.108	0.786	13	2.860	0.966

1 = not accomplished
2 = partially accomplished
3 = satisfactorily accomplished
4 = accomplished well

Kendall coefficient of concordance = w = .91

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

probably correct. They said the evaluation probably only occurred if the student teacher asked for it because evaluation after teaching is much more important than evaluation prior to teaching. The Kendall coefficient of concordance W was calculated to compare the rankings of accomplishment of the 20 assignments. The value of the Kendall coefficient of concordance W was .90 indicating very strong agreement.

Performance of University Supervisors

Table 5 presents the results of the ratings for the performance of university supervisors. Cooperating teachers rated the performance of university supervisors as superior in conducting formal conferences. For all other activities, the university supervisor group was rated above average. The lowest rated activity was: the university supervisor serves as a resource person for the cooperating teacher.

The student teacher group rated the university supervisors above average on seven of the eight activities. The one activity rated as average was: evaluates each lesson plan before observing the student teacher teach in varying teaching situations.

Performance of Cooperating Teachers

Table 6 summarizes the results of the ratings for the cooperating teachers' performances. University supervisors rated the performance of cooperating teachers as above average for 19 of the 30 activities. Three activities were rated as below average. Student teachers rated the cooperating teachers above average for 21 of the 27 activities. The three activities rated as below average by the university supervisor group were three of the four lowest rated by the student teacher group. The three activities were: (a) critiques each lesson prepared by the student teacher prior to the lesson being taught; (b) has the student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least two weeks prior to actual teaching; and (c) gives the student teacher opportunity to plan and conduct an adult and/or continuing education program.

Student teachers rated the performance of cooperating teachers above average for: identifies the necessary procedures to follow in conducting supervised occupational experience visits; and takes the student teacher on many occupational experience visits during the first three days of student teaching. University supervisors rated cooperating teachers as average in these two activities. Student teachers also reported that the average number of visits where the cooperating teacher taught the procedure to follow when conducting supervised occupational experience visits was five. Approximately 11% reported no such visits conducted, while 35% indicated two or three visits completed. Also, on the average, three visits were completed where the cooperating teacher supervised the student teacher's ability to conduct occupational experience visits. Approximately 30% reported no such visits were completed, and 23% experienced one such visit.

Table 5

Rank Order of Mean Levels of Performance of University Supervisors as Perceived by Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers

Activities	Cooperating Teachers RANK	Cooperating Teachers MEAN (N = 76)	Cooperating Teachers SD	Student Teachers RANK	Student Teachers MEAN (N = 108)	Student Teachers SD
Conducts conferences where: the student teacher expresses concerns, anxieties and satisfactions; the university supervisor elicits ideas for self-improvement from the student teacher; and the university supervisor assists the student teacher in suggesting alternative solutions to teaching problems	1	8.039	1.038	5	7.167	1.721
Confers with cooperating teacher during visits regarding the student teacher's progress	2	7.961	1.051	-	-	-
Visits the cooperative training center early in the quarter	3	7.829	1.237	1	7.352	1.821
Conducts conferences with both cooperating teacher and student teacher to provide encouragement, constructive criticism and recognition of success	4	7.816	1.128	2	7.333	1.708
Works cooperatively with school administration, cooperating teacher and student teacher to provide the best possible student teaching experience	5	7.803	1.069	3	7.194	1.795
Prepares a written recommendation for the student teacher	6	7.712	1.034	-	-	-
Visits the school at least three times during the quarter and observes the student teacher in varying teaching situations	7	7.684	1.507	4	7.185	2.119
Reviews with cooperating teacher and student teacher the plan of activities and responsibilities for the student teaching experience early in the quarter	8	7.645	1.080	7	6.935	1.891
Explains the student teaching program to local administration and cooperating teacher and provides them with necessary materials	9	7.276	1.401	6	7.009	1.649
Assists cooperating teacher in planning and carrying through a program of evaluation of the student teacher	10	7.240	1.261	-	-	-
Evaluates each lesson plan before observing the student teacher teach in varying teaching situations	11	6.770	1.299	8	5.593	2.238
Serves as a resource person for the cooperating teacher	12	6.697	1.433	-	-	-
Grand Means for Common Activities =		7.570			6.971	
Grand Means =		7.539			6.971	

1 = poor
5 = average
9 = superior

Kendall coefficient of rank correlation = .64

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6

Rank Order of Mean Levels of Peformance for Cooperating Teachers as Perceived by University Supervisors and Student Teachers

Activities	University Supervisors RANK	MEAN (N = 14)	SD	Student Teachers RANK	MEAN (N = 108)	SD
Writes a reference letter for student teacher's placement file	1	7.571	0.514	-	-	-
Discusses and evaluates student teacher's performance with university supervisor	2	7.429	1.222	-	-	-
Involves student teacher as part of faculty	3	7.214	0.893	3	7.574	1.778
Finds housing for student teacher	4	7.143	1.406	13	6.831	2.247
Provides student teacher opportunity to assume full teaching responsibilities near end of quarter	5	7.071	1.072	1	8.112	1.334
Provides student teacher accessibility to instructional materials, an area for work and personal belongings, audio-visual equipment and other resource materials	6	6.857	1.231	2	7.657	1.698
Does not expect student teacher to teach exactly as cooperating teacher does and tries not let biases show and influence student teacher	7	6.643	1.550	4	7.426	1.692
Prepares class for arrival of student teacher	8	6.571	1.284	14	6.804	2.016
Orients student teacher to school and community	9	6.500	0.941	6	7.269	1.842
Provides opportunities for various teaching experiences with some freedom to experiment with teaching strategies	11	6.429	1.453	5	7.274	1.563
Provides student teacher with understanding of the extent of teacher authority and responsibilities	11	6.429	1.222	7	7.250	1.601
Provides enthusiastic and professional example for student teacher	11	6.429	1.399	12	7.000	2.175
Becomes familar with background of student teacher	13	6.357	1.393	10	7.162	1.772
Able to evaluate his or her own strengths and weaknesses as a cooperating teacher	14	6.231	0.927	15	6.738	1.756
Provides frequent encouragement, constructive criticism and recognition of success	15	6.214	1.311	11	7.056	2.020
Reviews student and faculty handbooks with student teacher	17	6.071	1.385	18	6.407	2.114
Reviews plan of activities and responsibilities for student teaching in agricultural education	17	6.071	1.207	16	6.579	2.024
Gives student teacher every possible opportunity to serve as FFA adviser	17	6.071	1.639	19	6.262	2.279
Keeps records and writes evaluative reports about student teacher's progress and general promise as a teacher	19	6.000	1.468	-	-	-
Demonstrates good teaching techniques	20	5.769	1.589	9	7.157	1.757
Reviews PRIDE report with student teacher	21	5.750	1.422	25	5.157	2.673
Encourages student teacher to observe teaching and ask questions	22	5.462	1.613	8	7.213	1.691
Conducts a formal evaluation at the end of the third, sixth and tenth weeks of student teaching	23	5.357	1.598	21	6.056	2.178
Identifies the necessary procedures to follow in conducting occupational experience visits	24	5.244	1.672	20	6.231	2.116
Evaluates the student teachers progress and experiences and gives daily feedback	25	5.143	1.916	17	6.551	2.142
Takes student teacher on many occupational experience visits during the first three days of student teaching	26	4.500	2.410	23	5.693	2.762
Has high school students occupational goals summarized for student teacher and reviews them with student teacher	27	4.154	1.772	22	5.898	2.078
Critiques each lesson prepared by student teacher prior to the lesson being taught	28	3.929	1.462	24	5.361	2.362
Has student teacher plan each unit of instruction at least two weeks prior to actual teaching	29	3.857	1.791	26	4.943	2.179
Gives student teacher opportunity to plan and conduct an adult and/or continuing education program	30	3.571	1.869	27	4.689	2.702
Grand Means for Common Activities =		5.815			6.602	
Grand Means =		5.934			6.602	

1 = poor
5 = average
9 = superior

Kendall coefficient of rank correlation = .69

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONCLUSIONS

1. All experiences expected during student teaching in Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University should be continued except two: experiences with FFA Alumni Affiliates; and experiences in conducting visits concerning individual problems of adults.

2. The current level of preparation of student teachers in the pedagogical areas such as methods of teaching, evaluation of students and lesson planning should be continued.

3. The Department of Agricultural Education at The Ohio State University should not continue to graduate students with their current level of competency in adult education, supervised occupational experience programs, record books and FFA.

4. To be better prepared for student teaching, students should have an increased amount of experience and training in adult education, supervised occupational experience programs, record books and FFA.

5. Assignments help add structure to student teaching. To be most effective, each assignment should enhance the student teaching experiences. The assignments' importance and purpose should be clearly defined for the university supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers. More attention should be given to the assignments by faculty during and following student teaching.

6. University supervisors and cooperating teachers should clearly understand their role as a member of the student teaching triad.

   a. For the university supervisors, activities needing greatest emphasis were:

      i) Evaluating student teacher's lesson plan prior to observing the student teacher teach; and

      ii) Serving as a resource person for the cooperating teacher.

   b. For the cooperating teachers, activities needing greatest emphasis were:

      i) Feedback on lesson plans prior to teaching;

      ii) Evaluating student teacher's performance after teaching;

      iii) Allowing the student teacher opportunity to conduct an adult and/or continuing education program; and

iv) Demonstrating how to make supervised occupational experience visits and being sure student teacher has the ability to make visits

7. Most areas of weakness for the experiences during student teaching were in areas where student teachers had little or no training prior to student teaching. Most areas of weakness in the performance of the cooperating teacher were in areas where the cooperating teacher was to provide instruction of some type. One could conclude that the Department of Agricultural Education and the cooperating teachers are incongruent in their expectations of student teaching. The Department sees student teaching as practice teaching and also a place to learn new knowledge, while cooperating teachers see student teaching primarily as practice teaching.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Agricultural Education faculty must decide if adult education is a responsibility of the vocational agriculture teacher. If it is, then the Department should stand firm in making student teachers gain experiences in adult education. If it is not a responsibility, then student teachers should not be expected to gain experiences in adult education.

2. Experiences in FFA, supervised occupational experience programs, record books and adult education should be made available to students both prior to and during student teaching. This can be done through formal course work, workshops, insisting that students attend various FFA activities, student teacher seminars and the Agricultural Education Society.

3. Better preparation of cooperating teachers is essential. Three different opportunities should be available for their training:

a. A required course for all approved teachers interested in being a cooperating teacher;

b. A workshop at Tech Update each summer; and

c. A one-day seminar at the beginning of the third week of the quarter in which the cooperating teacher has a student teacher for the purpose of addressing the immediate concerns of the cooperating teacher.

4. The Agricultural Education faculty must insist that those experiences deemed essential for student teaching be accomplished during student teaching.

5. Obtain evaluations of the cooperating teachers based on their responsibilities (similar to what has been done here) each quarter from university supervisors and student teachers. Consistent negative feedback

from university supervisors and student teachers is important for assisting in improving the cooperating teacher or weeding out those cooperating teachers who are not as effective as they should be.

6. Select a set of assignments which enhance the student teaching experiences. Of the current assignments, delete: survey of each student's reading habits in classes taught, maintain diary, prepare article about student teacher for local or school newspaper and adult education assignments if adult education is considered not important. Add the following assignments:

a. Student teacher is videotaped at least twice during the quarter (third week and ninth week). Have the cooperating teacher and student teacher evaluate performance.

b. Student teacher must observe four instructional techniques demonstrated by the cooperating teacher. Use a checklist to show assignment was completed.

c. Keep a calendar of activities much the same as a vocational agriculture teacher would. Prepare student teacher beforehand as to what should be on calendar.

d. Include an assignment that student teacher is to take complete control of one FFA activity (judging team, committee event, picnic) and follow through on it during student teaching.

REFERENCES

Agricultural Education Department. A Handbook for Student Teachers. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1981.

Agricultural Education Department. Professional Performance Activities in Agricultural Education. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1981.

Andrews, L. O. Student Teaching. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Andrews, L. O. Challenges and Needed Developments in Teacher Education. Baltimore Multi-State Teacher Education Project, 1969.

Baltzell, D. C. "The Standardized Case Study: A Hybrid Approach to Quantitative/Qualitative Issue." Paper presented at AERA, April 1980.

Bennie, W. A. "A Campus Supervision of Student Teachers--A Closer Look." Teachers College Journal, 1964, 131-133.

Brown, T. J. Student Teaching in a Secondary School. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Chambliss, T. A. "An Evaluation of the Auburn University School of Education Student Teaching Program" (University Microfilms No. 6306773). Doctoral Dissertation, Auburn University, 1963.

Chiu, L. H. "Influence of Student Teaching on Perceived Teaching Competence." Perceptual and Motor Skills, June 1975, 40, 872-874.

Conant, J. B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963.

Corrigan, L. and Griswold, T. "Attitude Change of Student Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, 1963, 57, 93-95.

Cottrell, Donald (ed.). Teacher Education in Agriculture (2nd ed.). Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1956.

Cross, A. (ed.). "Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs." Teacher Education in Agriculture (2nd ed.). Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers.

Cruickshank, D. "Curriculum and Instruction in Teacher Education." Class lecture, The Ohio State University, 1981.

Davis. Elementary Survey Analysis, 1971.

Denzin, N. K. "The Logic of Naturalistic Inquiry." Sociological Methods: A Source Book. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Dewey, John. Experience in Education. New York: The McMillan Co., 1938.

Dunham, C. "Field Attitudes of Student Teachers, College Advisors and School Teachers Toward Youth." Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1958.

Elkind, B. "Going To Be a Cooperative Teacher?" Instructor, 1976, 86, 81-83.

Flesher, W. R. "A Need and Plan." In Wilson, R. H. (ed.) A University Department Evaluates Its Curriculum. Ohio: Division of Vocational Education, Ohio Department of Education, 1958.

Friebus, R. "Agents of Socialization Involved in Student Teaching." Journal of Educational Research, 1977, 70, 263-268.

Inglow, G. M. "The Complex Role of the University Supervisor." In Johnson, J. and Perry, F. (eds.) Readings in Student Teaching. Iowa: William C. Brown Book Co., 1967.

Karmos, A. H. and Jacko, C. M. "The Role of Significant Others During the Student Teaching Experience." Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28 (5), 51-55.

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of Behavioral Research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Kuehl, R. "Taxonomy for Critical Tasks for Supervising Teachers." (ED 179507).

Lewin, K. Resolving Social Conflicts. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.

Little, H. Handbook for Supervisors of Student Teaching. Nashville, Tennessee: Marshall and Bruce Co., 1947.

Mannebach, A. J. and Drawbaugh, C. C. "Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs." In Berkey, A. L. (ed.) Teacher Education in Agriculture (2nd ed.). Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.

Morris, J. "Effects of the University Supervisor on the Performance and Adjustment of Student Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, 1974, 67, 358-362.

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Plan the Student Teaching Experience, Module I-7. Georgia: American Association for Vocational Instructional Materials, 1978.

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Supervising Student Teachers, Module I-8. Georgia: American Association for Vocational Instructional Materials, 1978.

Ohio Agricultural Education Directory, 1981-82. Columbus, Ohio: State Department of Education, 1981.

Ohio Department of Education. Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers, 1975.

Patton, M. Q. Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1980.

Pearsol, J. A. "Combining Qualitative Educational Research Methods: A Perspective." Paper presented during the American Vocational Association Conference, 1980.

Peterson, R. L. A Handbook for Student Teachers and Supervising Teachers in Vocational Agriculture. St. Paul, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1978.

Seperson, M. A. and Joyce, B. R. "Teaching Styles and Student Teachers as Related to Those of Their Cooperating Teachers." Educational Leadership Research Supplement, 1973, 31, 146-151.

Steeves, F. L. Issues in Student Teaching. New York: Odyssey Press, Inc., 1963.

Stewart, B. R., Shinn, G. C. and Richardson, W. B. "Concerns of Professionals in Agricultural Education." Agricultural Education Magazine, 1977, 49, 284, 287.

Tanner, D. "An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Program at The Ohio State University by Agricultural Education Graduates." Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1955.

Thorpe, L. "An Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience Offered to Students Majoring in Elementary Education at The University of Nebraska" (University Microfilms No. 7227435). Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Nebraska, 1972.

Worthen, B. R. and Sanders, J. R. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973.

Van Maaen, J. "Qualitative Methods: A Retrospective Look." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1979, 24, 520-526.

Yee, A. H. "Do Cooperating Teachers Influence the Attitude of Student Teachers?" Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 327-332.

Zimpher, N. L., de Voss, G. C. and Nott, D. L. "A Closer Look at University Student Teacher Supervision." Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31, 11-15.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH SERIES

Agricultural educators have believed in "learning by doing." Student teaching provides the opportunity for university students who are preparing as teachers to practice theory and gain in competence and confidence. Is student teaching providing a good learning experience? In what ways can the student teaching program be improved? Student teaching at The Ohio State University has traditionally received high ratings by graduates who are teaching. This study examines the program and provides recommendations for improvement in this important component of preservice education.

This summary is based on a Doctor of Philosophy dissertation by Jill Pfister under the direction of L. H. Newcomb. Dr. Pfister is an Academic Counselor and Staff Assistant, Agricultural Administration, The Ohio State University. Dr. Newcomb is a Professor, Department of Agricultural Education, The Ohio State University. Special appreciation is due Douglas Bishop, Professor, Department of Agricultural & Industrial Education, Montana State University; Dr. Floyd L. McKinney, Senior Research Specialist, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University; and Dr. Rodney Tulloch, Professor, Department of Agricultural Education, University of Kentucky for their critical review of this manuscript prior to its publication.

Research has been an important function of the Department of Agricultural Education since it was established in 1917. Research conducted by the Department has generally been in the form of graduate theses, staff studies and funded research. The purpose of this series is to make useful knowledge from such research available to practitioners in the profession. Individuals desiring additional information on this topic should examine the references cited.

J. David McCracken
Department of Agricultural Education

SR 33 **1984**